arXiv:1609.08785v1 [math.AP] 28 Sep 2016

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE LINEARIZED PRANDTL EQUATION AROUND A NON-MONOTONIC SHEAR FLOW

DONGXIANG CHEN, YUXI WANG, AND ZHIFEI ZHANG

Abstract. In this paper, we prove the well-posedness of the linearized Prandtl equation around a non-monotonic shear flow in Gevrey class $2-\theta$ for any $\theta > 0$. This result is almost optimal by the ill-posedness result proved by Gérard-Varet and Dormy, who construct a class of solution with the growth like $e^{\sqrt{k}t}$ for the linearized Prandtl equation around a non-monotonic shear flow.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the Prandtl equation in $\mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}^2_+$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + u\partial_x u + v\partial_y u - \partial_y^2 u + \partial_x p = 0, \\ \partial_x u + \partial_y v = 0, \\ u|_{y=0} = v|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim\limits_{y\to+\infty} u(t,x,y) = U(t,x), \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where (u, v) denotes the tangential and normal velocity of the boundary layer flow, and $(U(t,x), p(t,x))$ is the values on the boundary of the tangential velocity and pressure of the outflow, which satisfies the Bernoulli's law

$$\partial_t U + U\partial_x U + \partial_x p = 0.$$

This system introduced by Prandtl [15] is the foundation of the boundary layer theory. It describes the first order approximation of the velocity field near the boundary in the zero viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equations with non-slip boundary condition. One may check [14] for more introductions on the boundary layer theory.

To justify the zero viscosity limit, one of key step is to deal with the well-posedness of the Prandtl equation. Due to the lack of horizontal diffusion in (1.1), the nonlinear term $v\partial_y u$ will lead to one horizontal derivative loss in the process of energy estimate. Up to now, the question of whether the Prandtl equation with general data is well-posed in Sobolev spaces is still open except for some special cases:

• Under a monotonic assumption on the tangential velocity of the outflow, Oleinik [14] proved the local existence and uniqueness of classical solutions to (1.1). With the additional favorable condition on the pressure, Xin and Zhang [17] obtained the global existence of weak solutions to (1.1).

• For the data which is analytic in x, y variables, Sammartino and Caflisch [16] established the local well-posedness of (1.1). Later, the analyticity in y variable was removed by Lombardo, Cannone and Sammartino [11]. Zhang and the third author [18] also established the long time well-posedness of (1.1) for small tangential analytic data.

Date: September 29, 2016.

Recently, Alexandre et al. [1] and Masmoudi and Wong [12] independently develop direct energy method to prove the well-posedness of the Prandtl equation for monotonic data in Sobolev spaces. Their works might shed some light on the zero viscosity limit problem in Sobolev spaces. See also [9] for the case with multiple monotonicity regions. Recently, we also present an elementary proof by using the paralinearized technique [3].

On the other hand, Gérard-Varet and Dormy [5] proved the ill-posedness in Sobloev spaces for the linearized Prandtl equation around non-monotonic shear flows. The nonlinear ill-posedness was also established in [7, 8] in the sense of non-Lipschtiz continuity of the flow. However, Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi [6] can prove the well-posedness of the Prandtl equation (1.1) for a class of data in Gevrey class $\frac{7}{4}$. In [6], the authors conjectured that their result should not be optimal. The analysis and numerics performed in [5] suggest that the optimal exponent may be $s = 2$. Indeed, Gérard-Varet and Dormy constructed a class of solution with the growth like $e^{\sqrt{k}t}$ for the linearized Prandtl equation around a non-monotonic shear flow, where k is the tangential frequency.

The goal of this paper is to prove the well-posedness of the linearized Prandtl equation around a non-monotonic shear flow in Gevrey class $2-\theta$ for any $\theta > 0$. This result is almost optimal and in particular implies that the instability mechanism found in [5] should be severe. The same ideas can be applied to deal with nonlinear Prandtl equation. However, the proof is more involved technically. So, this will be presented in a separable paper in order to present our ideas more clearly here.

Let $u^s(t,y)$ be the solution of the heat equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^s - \partial_y^2 u^s = 0, \\ u^s|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim\limits_{y\to+\infty} u^s(t,y) = 1, \\ u^s|_{t=0} = u_0^s(y). \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Obviously, $(u^s(t,y),0)$ is a shear flow solution of the Prandtl equation (1.1). Let us assume that $\partial_y u_0(1) = 0$ and for some $c, \delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_y^2 u_0^s(y) \geq c \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \big[\frac{1}{2}, 2\big], \\ &\big|\partial_y u_0^s(y)\big| \geq c\delta e^{-y} \quad \text{for} \quad y \in [0, 1-\delta] \cup \big[1+\delta, +\infty\big). \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

The linearized Prandtl equation around $(u^s, 0)$ takes as follows

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + u^s \partial_x u + v \partial_y u^s - \partial_y^2 u = 0, \\ \partial_x u + \partial_y v = 0, \\ u|_{y=0} = v|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim\limits_{y\to+\infty} u(t,x,y) = 0, \\ u(0,x,y) = u_0(x,y). \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

The main result of this paper is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Assume that $e^{\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+2\theta}} u_0 \in H^{\frac{1}{2},1}_{\mu}$ with $\partial_y^k u_0|_{y=0} = 0$ for $k = 0, 2$. Then there exists $T > 0$ so that (1.4) has a unique solution u in $[0,T]$, which satisfies (7.2). In particular, we have*

$$u_\Phi \in L^\infty(0,T; H^{\frac{1}{4}+\theta,1}_{\mu}).$$

Here we denote

$$f_\Phi \triangleq \mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(e^{\Phi(t,\xi)}\widehat{f}(\xi)\big), \quad \Phi(t,\xi) \triangleq (1-\lambda t)\langle\xi\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+2\theta},$$

and $H^{s,\sigma}_{\mu}$ is the weighted Sobolev space with $\mu = e^{\frac{y}{2}}$ which will be introduced later.

Remark 1.1. *Li and Yang* [10] *proved the well-posedness of nonlinear Prandtl equation in Gevrey class 2 for the data with non-degenerate critical point and polynomial decay in y. They used Gérard-Varet and Masmoudi's framework with an introduction of a new unknown $h_1 = \partial_y^2 u - \frac{\partial_y^3 u^s}{\partial_y^2 u^s}\partial_y u$, which is used to control the regularity of $\partial_y^2 u$. In the last section, we will explain how to obtain the well-posedness of* (1.4) *in Gevrey class 2 by using our framework and h_1. Two methods should be helpful to understand the complex structure of the Prandtl equation and provide evidence about the conjecture that the well-posedness in Gevrey class 2 is optimal.*

Let us present some key ingredients of our proof.

1. Gevrey regularity estimate in monotonic domain. Motivated by [1], we will introduce the good unknown $w_1 = \partial_y\big(\frac{u}{\partial_y u^s}\big)$ to control the horizontal regularity of the solution in this domain, which satisfies
$$\partial_t w_1 + u^s\partial_x w_1 - \partial_y^2 w_1 = \partial_y F_1.$$
The key point is that the equation of w_1 does not lose the derivative.
2. Gevrey regularity estimate in non-monotonic domain. Because w_1 does not make sense in non-monotonic domain, motivated by [6], we introduce $h = d\partial_y u, d = (\partial_y^2 u^s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ to control the horizontal regularity of the solution in this domain, which satisfies
$$\partial_t h + u^s\partial_x h - \partial_y^2 h + d(v\partial_y^2 u^s) = (\partial_t d - \partial_y^2 d)\partial_y u - 2\partial_y d\partial_y^2 u.$$
All the terms in this equation are good except $d(v\partial_y^2 u^s)$. The key point is
$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} d(v\partial_y^2 u^s)h\,dxdy = 0. \tag{1.5}$$
So, this term is also good in the energy estimate. However, the localization in y variable will destroy the cancellation structure (1.5). In particular, the energy estimate in non-monotonic domain will give rise to a new trouble term
$$\big(\phi_3(y)\phi_3'(y)v, u\big)_{L^2}, \tag{1.6}$$
which can be reduced to control the terms like $(w_i, \partial_x u)_{L^2}, i = 1, 2$ modulus some lower order terms. Here $w_2 = \partial_y u^s\partial_y u - \partial_y^2 u^s u$ and $\phi_3(y)$ is a cut-off function supported in non-monotonic domain. To control them, we need to use the Gevrey regularity and the following
3. Anisotropic regularity estimates. The unknowns w_i and h have to work in the functional spaces with different horizontal regularity. Roughly speaking,
$$\phi_3(y)h_\Phi \in L^2\big(0,T;H^{\frac{1}{4},0}\big), \quad \phi_1(y)(w_1)_\Phi,\ \phi_3(y)(w_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac{3}{4},0}).$$
Here $\phi_1(y)$ is a cut-off function supported in monotonic domain.
4. The derivative gain of w_1 can be easily obtained by using Gevrey regularity and good structure of w_1. The unknown $w_2 = \partial_y u^s\partial_y u - \partial_y^2 u^s u$ satisfies an equation similar to w_1, but with a key trouble term in the $H^{\frac{1}{2},0}$ energy estimate, which takes
$$\big(\phi_3(y)\partial_y^2 u^s\partial_y^2 u_\Phi, \phi_3(y)(w_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}.$$

The main difficulty is that one can not deduce $\phi_3(y)\partial_y^2 u_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac{1}{4},0})$ from $\phi_3(y)h_\Phi \in L^2\big(0,T;H^{\frac{1}{4},0}\big)$. However, one can prove $\phi_3(y)(w_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac{5}{8},0})$ by using some key structures found in [6]. As we said above, this estimate is not enough to handle (1.6). On the other hand, one can prove the same regularity as w_1 in the framework of Gevrey class $\frac{7}{4}$. This may be the main reason why the work [6] can achieve the well-posedness in Gevrey class $\frac{7}{4}$.

5. Improved regularity estimate of w_2. Compared with w_1, w_2 lose $\frac{1}{8}$-order derivative. However, we find that $\varphi^{1+\theta_1}\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+\theta}(w_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;L^2)$, where φ is a cut-off function vanishing at critical point. Compared with the work [6], this weighted estimate is completely new, and moreover is enough to handle (1.6). The price to pay is to use Gevrey $2-\theta$ regularity.
6. In our framework, if we use the unknown h_1, we can easily deduce $\phi_3(y)\partial_y^2 u_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac{1}{4},0})$, thus $\phi_3(y)(w_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac{3}{4},0})$ and avoid the Gevrey regularity loss. This will be explained in the last section.

Let us conclude the introduction with the following notations. Let $\omega(y)$ be a nonnegative function in $\mathbf{R}^+$. We introduce the weighted L^p norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p_\omega} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|\omega(y)f(x,y)\|_{L^p}, \quad \|f\|_{L^p_{y,\omega}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|\omega(y)f(y)\|_{L^p}.$$

The weighted anisotropic Sobolev space $H^{s,\ell}_\omega$ for $s=k+\sigma$ and $k,\ell\in\mathbf{N},\sigma\in[0,1)$ consists of all functions $f\in L^2_\omega$ satisfying

$$\|f\|^2_{H^{s,\ell}_\omega} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha\le k}\sum_{\beta\le\ell}\|\partial_x^\alpha\langle D_x\rangle^\sigma\partial_y^\beta f\|^2_{L^2_\omega} < +\infty.$$

We denote by $H^\ell_{y,\omega}$ the weighted Sobolev space in $\mathbf{R}_+$, which consists of all functions $f\in L^2_{y,\omega}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|^2_{H^\ell_{y,\omega}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\beta\le\ell}\|\partial_y^\beta f\|^2_{L^2_{y,\omega}} < +\infty.$$

In the case when $\omega=1$, we denote $H^{k,\ell}_\omega$ by $H^{k,\ell}$, and $H^\ell_{y,\omega}$ by H^ℓ_y for the simplicity.

2. Basic estimates for the shear flow

Let $u^s(t,y)$ be the solution of the heat equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^s - \partial_y^2 u^s = 0, \\ u^s|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim\limits_{y\to+\infty} u^s(t,y) = 1, \\ u^s|_{t=0} = u_0^s(y). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $\partial_y u_0^s \in H^3_{y,\mu}$ and $u_0^s(0)=0, \partial_y^2 u_0^s(0)=0$. Then it holds that for any $t\in[0,+\infty)$,*

$$E^s(t) \overset{def}{=} \|\partial_y u^s(t)\|^2_{H^3_{y,\mu}} + \int_0^t \|\partial_y u^s(\tau)\|^2_{H^4_{y,\mu}}d\tau \le \|\partial_y u_0^s\|^2_{H^3_{y,\mu}} e^{Ct}.$$

Moreover, if for $k=0,1,2,3$,

$$|\partial_y^k\big(u_0^s-1\big)(y)| \le c^{-1}e^{-y} \qquad \textit{for} \quad y\in[0,+\infty),$$

then we have

$$|\partial_y^k(u^s(t,y)-1)| \le Ce^{-y},$$

for $(t,y)\in[0,1]\times[0,+\infty)$.

Proof. Taking $L^2_{y,\mu}$ inner product between the first equation of (2.1) and u^s_t , we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\partial_y u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|u^s_t\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} \le C\|\partial_y u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}}.$$

Taking the time derivative to the first equation of (2.1), then taking $L^2_{y,\mu}$ inner product between the resulting equation and u^s_t, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u^s_t\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|\partial_y u^s_t\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} \le C\|u^s_t\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}}.$$

And taking $L^2_{y,\mu}$ inner product between the resulting equation and $\partial_y^2 u^s_t$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\partial_y\partial_t u^s\|_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|\partial_y^2\partial_t u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} \le C\|\partial_y\partial_t u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_t^2 u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}}.$$

Taking the $\partial_t\partial_y$ to the first equation of (2.1), then taking $L^2_{y,\mu}$ inner product between the resulting equation and $\partial_t\partial_y^3 u^s$, we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\partial_y^2\partial_t u^s\|_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|\partial_t\partial_y^3 u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} \le C\|\partial_y^2\partial_t u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_y\partial_t^2 u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}}.$$

Using $\partial_t u^s = \partial_y^2 u^s$, we deduce from Gronwall's inequality that

$$\|\partial_y u^s(t)\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|u^s_t(t)\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|\partial_y\partial_t u^s\|_{L^2_{y,\mu}} + \|\partial_y^2\partial_t u^s\|^2_{L^2_{y,\mu}} \le \|\partial_y u^s_0\|^2_{H^3_{y,\mu}} e^{Ct},$$

from which and $\partial_t u^s = \partial_y^2 u^s$, it follows that

$$E^s(t) \le \|\partial_y u^s_0\|^2_{H^3_{y,\mu}} e^{Ct}.$$

For the pointwise estimates, we need to use the representation formula of the solution

$$u^s(t,y) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}} - e^{-\frac{(y+y')^2}{4t}}\Big)u^s_0(y')dy'.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} u^s(t,y)-1 =& -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{(y+y')^2}{4t}}u^s_0(y')dy' + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}(u^s_0(y')-1)dy' \\ &+ \Big(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}dy' - 1\Big) \\ \triangleq& I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

The result is obvious for $|y|\le 4$. So, we assume $y\ge 4\ge 4t$. Thanks to $|u^s_0(y)|\le C$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| \le& \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4t}}\, e^{-\frac{2yy'+(y')^2}{4t}}|u^s_0(y')|dy' \\ \le& \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4t}}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{(y')^2}{4t}}|u^s_0(y')|dy' \\ \le& Ce^{-y}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $|u_0^s(y)-1|\leq c^{-1}e^{-y}$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}|I_2|\leq&e^{-y}\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}e^{y-y'}\ |u_0^s(y')-1|\ e^{y'}dy'\\ \leq&Ce^{-y}\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-\frac{y'^2}{4t}}e^{y'}dy'\\ \leq&Ce^{-y}e^{t}\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-(\xi-\sqrt{t})^2}d\xi\\ \leq&Ce^{-y}.\end{aligned}$$

For I_3, we have

$$|I_3|\leq\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\frac{y}{2\sqrt{t}}}^{+\infty}e^{-\xi^2}d\xi-1\Big|=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{\frac{y}{2\sqrt{t}}}^{+\infty}e^{-\xi^2}d\xi.$$

If $2\sqrt{t}\leq 1$, then

$$|I_3|\leq C\int_{\frac{y}{2\sqrt{t}}}^{+\infty}e^{-\xi}d\xi\leq Ce^{-\frac{y}{2\sqrt{t}}}\leq Ce^{-y},$$

and if $2\sqrt{t}\geq 1$ and $y\geq 4t$, then

$$|I_3|\leq C\int_{\frac{y}{2\sqrt{t}}}^{+\infty}e^{-2\sqrt{t}\xi}d\xi\leq\frac{C}{2\sqrt{t}}e^{-y}\leq Ce^{-y}.$$

Putting the estimates of I_1-I_3 together, we deduce that

$$|u^s(t,y)-1|\leq Ce^{-y}.$$

Thanks to $u_0^s(0)=0$ and $\partial_y^2u_0^s(0)=0$, we get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_yu^s(t,y)=&\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}+e^{-\frac{(y+y')^2}{4t}}\Big)\partial_yu_0^s(y')dy',\\ \partial_y^2u^s(t,y)=&\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}-e^{-\frac{(y+y')^2}{4t}}\Big)\partial_y^2u_0^s(y')dy',\\ \partial_y^3u^s(t,y)=&\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi t}}\int_0^{+\infty}\Big(e^{-\frac{(y-y')^2}{4t}}+e^{-\frac{(y+y')^2}{4t}}\Big)\partial_y^3u_0^s(y')dy'.\end{aligned}$$

Then in the same derivation as in I_2, we have for $k=1,2,3$,

$$|\partial_y^ku^s(t,y)|\leq Ce^{-y}\quad\text{for }(t,y)\in[0,1]\times[0,+\infty).$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u_0^s(y)$ be as in Proposition 2.1. If $u_0^s(y)$ satisfies* (1.3)*, then there exists $T_1>0$ so that for any $t\in[0,T_1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_y^2u^s(t,y)\geq\frac{c}{2}\quad\textit{for}\quad y\in\big[\frac{1}{2},2\big],\\ &\partial_yu^s(t,y)\geq\frac{c}{2}\delta e^{-y}\quad\textit{for}\quad y\in[0,1-\delta]\cup\big[1+\delta,+\infty\big).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have

$$\partial_yu^s(t,y)=\partial_yu_0^s(y)+\int_0^t\partial_t\partial_yu^s(\tau,y)d\tau,$$

$$\partial_y^2 u^s(t,y) = \partial_y^2 u_0^s(y) + \int_0^t \partial_t \partial_y^2 u^s(\tau,y)d\tau.$$

Notice that

$$\Big| \int_0^t \partial_t \partial_y u^s(\tau,y)d\tau \Big| \le Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y^3 u^s\|_{L^2_t H^1_y},$$
$$\Big| \int_0^t \partial_t \partial_y^2 u^s(\tau,y)d\tau \Big| \le Ct^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_y^4 u^s\|_{L^2_t H^1_y}.$$

Then the lemma follows from Proposition 2.1 and (1.3). □

3. Introduction of good unknowns

An essential difficulty solving the Prandtl equations is the loss of one derivative in the horizontal direction x induced by the term $v\partial_y u^s$. To eliminate the trouble term $\partial_y u^s v$ in (1.4), it is natural to introduce a good unknown w_1 defined by

$$w_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_y\big(\frac{u}{\partial_y u^s}\big),$$

which is motivated by the work [1]. Then a direct calculation gives

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w_1 + u^s \partial_x w_1 - \partial_y^2 w_1 = \partial_y F_1, \\ \partial_y w_1|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim\limits_{y\to+\infty} w_1 = 0, \\ w_1|_{t=0} = w_0(x,y), \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where F_1 is given by

$$F_1 = u\partial_t\big(\frac{1}{\partial_y u^s}\big) - \big[\partial_y^2, \frac{1}{\partial_y u^s}\big]u.$$

Here we used the fact that $\partial_y^2 u = 0$ on $y = 0$, which can be seen from (1.4).

Notice that w_1 is only well-defined in the monotonic domain. While, Lemma 2.2 tells us

$$|\partial_y u^s(t,y)| \ge \frac{c\delta}{2} e^{-y} \quad \text{for} \quad (t,y) \in [0,T_1] \times \big([0,1-\delta] \cup [1+\delta,+\infty)\big). \tag{3.2}$$

Then it is natural to introduce a cut-off good known

$$\overline{w}_1 \triangleq e^{-\frac{y}{2}}\phi_1(y)\partial_y\big(\frac{u}{\partial_y u^s}\big) \triangleq \psi_1(y)\partial_y\big(\frac{u}{\partial_y u^s}\big),$$

where $\phi_1(y) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with the support included in $[0,1-\delta] \cup [1+\delta,+\infty)$ and $\phi_1(y) = 1$ in $\big[0,1-2\delta\big] \cup \big[1+2\delta,+\infty\big]$. A direct calculation shows

$$\partial_t \overline{w}_1 + u^s \partial_x \overline{w}_1 - \partial_y^2 \overline{w}_1 = [\psi_1(y), \partial_y^2] w_1 + \psi_1(y)\partial_y F_1. \tag{3.3}$$

To control the regularity of the solution in the non-monotonic domain, we need to use the non-degenerate condition

$$\partial_y^2 u^s(t,y) \ge \frac{c}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad (t,y) \in [0,T_1] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 2]. \tag{3.4}$$

Motivated by [6], we introduce a good unknown h defined by

$$h \overset{\text{def}}{=} d\partial_y u,$$

where $d(t,y)=\phi_3(y)(\partial_y^2u^s)^{-1/2}$ and $\phi_3(y)$ is a cut-off function supported in $[\frac{1}{2},2]$ and $\phi_3(y)=1$ as $y\in[\frac{3}{4},\frac{7}{4}]$. Then h satisfies

$$\partial_t h+u^s\partial_x h-\partial_y^2 h+d(v\partial_y^2u^s)=(\partial_t d-\partial_y^2 d)\partial_y u-2\partial_y d\partial_y^2 u. \tag{3.5}$$

To propagate the regularity of the solution from monotonic domain to non-monotonic domain, we need to introduce another good unknown $\overline{w}_2$

$$\overline{w}_2\overset{\text{def}}{=}\psi_2(y)\big(\partial_y u^s\partial_y u-u\partial_y^2u^s\big)\triangleq\psi_2(y)w_2, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\psi_2(y)\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with the support included in $[1-3\delta,1+3\delta]$ and $\psi_2(y)=1$ in $\big[1-2\delta,1+2\delta\big]$. It is easy to check that

$$\partial_t\overline{w}_2+u^s\partial_x\overline{w}_2-\partial_y^2\overline{w}_2=[\psi_2(y),\partial_y^2]w_2+\psi_2(y)F_2, \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$F_2=\partial_t\partial_y u^s\partial_y u+[\partial_y u^s,\partial_y^2]\partial_y u-u\partial_t\partial_y^2u^s-[\partial_y^2u^s,\partial_y^2]u.$$

In fact, w_1 and w_2 are basically equivalent in the monotonic domain by the relation

$$w_2=(\partial_y u^s)^2w_1.$$

This in particular implies that

Lemma 3.1. *It holds that*

$$\|1_{I_1}(y)(w_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\le C\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}},$$
$$\|1_{I_2}(y)(w_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\le C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}},$$

where $I_1=supp\phi_1'$ and $I_2=supp\psi_2'$.

Let $a(t)$ be a critical point of $u^s(t,y)$, i.e.,

$$\partial_y u^s(t,a(t))=0.$$

Therefore, $a(t)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t a(t)=-\frac{\partial_t\partial_y u^s(t,a)}{\partial_y^2u^s(t,a)},\quad a(0)=1.$$

By Proposition 2.1, there exists $T_2>0$ so that

$$|a(t)-1|\le 2\delta\quad\text{for}\quad t\in[0,T_2]. \tag{3.8}$$

Then u can be represented in terms of w_1,w_2. More precisely,

Lemma 3.2. *We can decompose u as $u=u_1+u_2$, where*

$$u_1=\begin{cases}\partial_y u^s\displaystyle\int_0^y\phi_1w_1dy' & \text{for}\quad y<1-2\delta,\\ \partial_y u^s\Big(\displaystyle\int_0^{1-2\delta}\phi_1w_1dy'+\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy'\Big) & \text{for}\quad 1-2\delta\le y<a(t),\\ \partial_y u^s\Big(\displaystyle\int_{1+2\delta}^{y}\frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy'+\int_2^{1+2\delta}\phi_1w_1dy'\Big) & \text{for}\quad a(t)<y<1+2\delta,\\ \partial_y u^s\displaystyle\int_2^y\phi_1w_1dy' & \text{for}\quad y\ge1+2\delta,\end{cases}$$

and

$$u_2 = \partial_y u^s \frac{u(t,x,2)}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)} 1_{\{y>a(t)\}}(y).$$

4. Gevrey regularity estimate of $\overline{w}_1$

In what follows, let us always assume that $T \leq \min(T_1, T_2)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\overline{w}_1$ be a smooth solution of (3.3) in $[0,T]$. Then it holds that for any $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + (\lambda - C)\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34+\theta,0}} + \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\ &\quad\leq C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Let us begin with the estimates of source term F_1.

Lemma 4.2. *It holds that*

$$\|\psi_1(y)\partial_y(F_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,0}} \leq C\big(\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,1}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big).$$

Proof. An easy calculation gives

$$F_1 = -2\frac{(\partial_y^2 u^s)^2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}u + 2\frac{\partial_y^2 u^s}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}\partial_y u.$$

By (3.2), we get

$$\|\psi_1(y)\partial_y(F_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{13}{4},0}} \leq C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + C\|\psi_1(y)e^y(\partial_y^2 u)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,0}}.$$

Notice that

$$\psi_1(y)\partial_y^2 u = \partial_y u^s\Big(\partial_y\overline{w}_1 - \psi_1' w_1 + 2\psi_1\frac{\partial_y u\partial_y^2 u^s}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} + \psi_1\partial_y(\frac{\partial_y^2 u^s}{(\partial_y u^s)^2})u\Big),$$

which along with Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$\|\psi_1(y)e^y(\partial_y^2 u)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,0}} \leq C\big(\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,1}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big).$$

Putting the above estimates together, we conclude the lemma. □

Now we are in position to prove proposition 4.1.

Proof. Applying $e^{\Phi(t,D_x)}$ to (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi + \lambda\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12+2\theta}(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi + u^s\partial_x(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi - \partial_y^2(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\\ &\qquad = [\psi_1(y),\partial_y^2](w_1)_\Phi + \psi_1(y)\partial_y(F_1)_\Phi.\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

Making $H^{\frac12,0}$ energy estimate to (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \lambda\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34+\theta,0}} - \big(\partial_y^2(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \big(u^s\partial_x(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\ &\quad = \big([\psi_1(y),\partial_y^2](w_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \big(\psi_1(y)\partial_y(F_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi|_{y=0} = 0$, we get by integration by parts that

$$-\big(\partial_y^2(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} = \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}, \quad \big(u^s\partial_x(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi, (\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} = 0.$$

We infer from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big([\psi_1(y),\partial_y^2](w_1)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\
&\leq 2\big|\big(\psi_1'(w_1)_\Phi,\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big|+2\big|\big(\psi_1''(w_1)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big|\\
&\leq C\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big(\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big)\\
&\leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big)+\frac18\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\psi_1(y)\partial_y(F_1)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\leq& C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\big)\\
&+\frac18\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}+C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up all the estimates, we conclude the proposition. □

5. Gevrey regularity estimate of $\overline{w}_2$

First of all, we prove Gevrey regularity without weight.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\overline{w}_2$ be a solution of (3.7) in $[0,T]$. There exists $\delta>0$ small enough so that for any $t\in[0,T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}+(\lambda-C)\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58+\theta,0}}+\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}\\
&\quad\leq C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition can be proved by following the proof of Proposition 4.1 and using the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\psi_2(y)(F_2)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac38,0}}\leq& C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}\big)\\
&+\frac12\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Notice that

$$-u\partial_t\partial_y^2u^s-[\partial_y^2u^s,\partial_y^2]u=2\partial_y^3u^s\partial_yu, \tag{5.1}$$

therefore,

$$\big(\psi_2(u\partial_t\partial_y^2u^s+[\partial_y^2u^s,\partial_y^2]u)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac38,0}}\leq C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\big(\psi_2(\partial_t\partial_yu^s\partial_yu+[\partial_yu^s,\partial_y^2]\partial_yu)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac38,0}}=-2\big(\psi_2\partial_y^2u^s\partial_y^2u_\Phi,(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac38,0}}.$$

The estimate of this term is very tricky. The following argument was motivated by [6]. By Lemma 3.2, ∂_yu can be written as $\partial_yu=\partial_yu_1+\partial_yu_2$. Note that both ∂_yu_1 and ∂_yu_2 are discontinuous across $y=a(t)$. In particular, we have

$$\lim_{y\to a(t)-}\partial_yu_1-\lim_{y\to a(t)+}\partial_yu_1=\partial_y^2u^s\frac{u(t,x,2)}{\partial_yu^s(t,2)}\triangleq J.$$

Then by integration by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\big(\psi_2(y)(\partial_y^2 u^s\partial_y^2 u)_\Phi,(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\big)_{H^{\frac38,0}} =& -2\int_{y>a(t)}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y^2u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&-2\int_{y<a(t)}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y^2u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&-2\int_{y>a(t)}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y^2u_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
=&2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2'(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&+2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^3u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&+2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&-2\int_{y>a(t)}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y^2u_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
&-2\int_{y=a(t)}\partial_y^2u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}J_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dx\\
\triangleq& A_1+\cdots+A_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\psi_2'(y)$ vanishes in a neighborhood of $y=a(t)$ so that ∂_yu_1 behaves like w_1 on the support of $\psi_2'(y)$. Thus,

$$A_1\le C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}.$$

Thanks to $\partial_y^2u_2=\partial_y^3u^s\frac{u(t,x,2)}{\partial_yu^s(t,2)}$, we obtain

$$A_4\le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$A_2\le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}.$$

For A_5, we get by Sobolev inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_5\le& C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^\infty_yL^2_x}\le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{13}{4},1}}\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^{\frac12}_{H^{\frac38,0}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^{\frac12}_{H^{\frac58,0}}\\
\le& C(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}})+\frac{1}{16}\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate A_3. One has

$$w_2=\partial_yu^s\partial_yu-u\partial_y^2u^s=\partial_yu^s\partial_yu_1-u_1\partial_y^2u^s,$$

which gives

$$\partial_yw_2=\partial_yu^s\partial_y^2u_1-u_1\partial_y^3u^s.$$

Then we may write

$$A_3=2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)^2\partial_y^2u^s\partial_yu^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_y^2u_1)_\Phi dxdy$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)^2\partial_y^2u^s\partial_y^3u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(u_1)_\Phi dxdy\\
=&-\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)^2(\partial_y^2u^s)^2(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi)^2dxdy\\
&-\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)^2\partial_y^3u^s\partial_yu^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi)^2dxdy\\
&-2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2'(y)\psi_2(y)\partial_y^2u^s\partial_yu^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi)^2dxdy\\
&-2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)^2\partial_yu^s\partial_y^3u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi dxdy\\
&+2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\psi_2(y)\partial_y^3u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
\triangleq&A_{31}+\cdots+A_{35}.
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have $\partial_y^2u^s\geq\frac{c}{2}>0$ on suppψ_2. So,

$$A_{31}\leq-\frac{c^2}{4}\|\psi_2(y)\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

On the other hand, $|\partial_yu^s|\leq C_1\delta$ on suppψ_2 with C_1 independent of δ. So,

$$A_{32}+A_{34}\leq C_1\delta\|\psi_2(y)\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$A_{35}\leq\delta\|\psi_2(y)\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+C\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}^2.$$

While, on the support of ψ_2', ∂_yu_1 behaves like $\overline{w}_1$ and $\overline{w}_2$. Similar to A_1, we have

$$A_{33}\leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2.$$

This shows that

$$A_3\leq-\big(\frac{c^2}{4}-C_1\delta\big)\|\psi_2(y)\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac38}(\partial_yu_1)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}^2\big)$$

Putting the above estimates together and taking δ small enough, we conclude our result. □

Next we prove Gevrey regularity estimate with weight. We introduce a weight function $\varphi(t,y)=\varphi(y-a(t))$, where $\varphi(0)=0$ and $\varphi(y)=0$ when $|y-1|>2\delta$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let w_2 be a solution of (3.7) in $[0,T]$ and $\theta_1>0$ be a small constant determined later. There exists $\delta>0$ small enough so that for any $t\in[0,T]$ and $\delta_2>0$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2+(\lambda-C)\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac34+\theta,0}}^2+\|\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2\\
&\leq C\Big(\big(\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}^2+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}^2+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}^2\Big)+\delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us begin with the following estimate of source term.

Lemma 5.4. *It holds that for any $\delta_2 > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\big((F_2)_\Phi, (w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} \le& C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + \|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\\ &+ \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}\Big) + \delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (5.1), it is easy to show that

$$\big((u\partial_t\partial_y^2 u^s + [\partial_y^2 u^s, \partial_y^2]u)_\Phi, (w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}} \le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu}\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\big((\partial_t\partial_y u^s\partial_y u + [\partial_y u^s, \partial_y^2]\partial_y u)_\Phi, (w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}\big)_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\ &= -2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y^2 u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &= -2\int_{y>a(t)}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y^2 u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\quad - 2\int_{y<a(t)}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y^2 u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\quad - 2\int_{y>a(t)}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y^2 u_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &= 2(1+\theta_1)\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y\varphi\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\quad + 2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^3 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\quad + 2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\quad - 2\int_{y>a(t)}\varphi(t,y)^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y^2 u_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\ &\triangleq B_1 + \cdots + B_4.\end{aligned}$$

Here integration by parts does not give rise to the boundary term due to $\varphi(t, a(t)) = 0$.

As $\partial_y^2 u_2 = \partial_y^3 u^s\frac{u(t,x,2)}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}$, we have

$$B_2 + B_4 \le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu}\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}.$$

Thanks to $|\partial_y\varphi| \le C$ and $\mathrm{supp}\partial_y\varphi \subset [1-2\delta, 1+2\delta]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}B_1 \le& C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\Big|\\ &+ C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{a(t)}^{1+2\delta}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y^2 u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\Big|\\ \triangleq& B_{11} + B_{12}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2, $\partial_y u_1$ can be expressed as

$$\partial_y u_1 = \begin{cases} \partial_y^2 u^s \Big(\displaystyle\int_0^{1-2\delta} \phi_1 w_1 dy' + \int_{1-2\delta}^{y} \frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy' \Big) + \frac{\overline{w}_2}{\partial_y u^s} & \text{for} \quad 1-2\delta \le y < a(t), \\ \partial_y^2 u^s \Big(\displaystyle\int_{1+2\delta}^{y} \frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy' + \int_{2}^{1+2\delta} \phi_1 w_1 dy' \Big) + \frac{\overline{w}_2}{\partial_y u^s} & \text{for} \quad a(t) < y < 1+2\delta. \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{11} \le & C \Big| \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} (\partial_y^2 u^s)^2 \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \big(\int_0^{1-2\delta} \phi_1 w_1 dy' \big)_\Phi \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dx dy \Big| \\ & + C \Big| \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} (\partial_y^2 u^s)^2 \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \big(\int_{1-2\delta}^{y} \frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy' \big)_\Phi \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dx dy \Big| \\ & + C \Big| \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} \frac{\partial_y^2 u^s}{\partial_y u^s} \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi dx dy \Big| \\ \triangleq & D_1 + D_2 + D_3. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to get

$$D_1 \le C \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}.$$

For $y \in [1-2\delta, a(t))$, φ and $\partial_y u^s$ behaves like $|y-a(t)|$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 \le & C \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \frac{\varphi^{\theta_1}}{\partial_y u^s} dy \| \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \|_{L^\infty_y L^2_x}^2 \\ \le & C \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \frac{1}{|y-a|^{1-\theta_1}} dy \| \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{3}{8}} \partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \|_{L^2} \| \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{5}{8}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \|_{L^2} \\ \le & C \|\partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}} \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 \le & C \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} \int_{1-2\delta}^{y} \frac{1}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy' dy \| \langle D_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \|_{L^\infty_y L^2_x}^2 \\ \le & C \|\partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}} \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} \int_{1-2\delta}^{y} \frac{1}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy' dy \le & C \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1} \int_{1-2\delta}^{y} \frac{1}{|y-a|^2} dy' dy \\ \le & C \int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \frac{1}{|y-a|^{1-\theta_1}} dy \le C. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for any $\delta_2 > 0$,

$$B_{11} \le C \big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}^2 + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}^2 \big) + \delta_2 \|\partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}^2.$$

The same argument shows that

$$B_{12} \le C \big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}^2 + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}^2 \big) + \delta_2 \|\partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}^2.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$B_1 \le C \big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}^2 + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}^2 \big) + 2\delta_2 \|\partial_y (\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}^2.$$

Now we deal with B_3. Similar to A_3 in Lemma 5.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_3 =& \int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} \varphi^{1+\theta_1}(\partial_y^2 u^s)^2(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\\
&- \int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} \varphi^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^3 u^s \partial_y u^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\\
&- (1+\theta_1)\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} \varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y\varphi\partial_y^2 u^s \partial_y u^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\\
&- 2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} \varphi^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y u^s \partial_y^3 u^s \langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi \langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi dxdy\\
&+ 2\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} \varphi^{1+\theta_1}\partial_y^3 u^s \langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi \langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy\\
\triangleq& B_{31}+\cdots+B_{35}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to $A_{31}, A_{32}, A_{34}, A_{35}$ in Lemma 5.2, we have

$$B_{31}+B_{32}+B_{34}+B_{35} \le -\big(\frac{c^2}{4}-C_1\delta\big)\|(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi \varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + C\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}.$$

Similar to B_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{33} \le& C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y u^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\Big|\\
&+ C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{a(t)}^{1+2\delta} \varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y u^s(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\Big| \triangleq E_1+E_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We get by (5.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 \le& C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y u^s\big(\int_0^{1-2\delta}\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\phi_1 w_1)_\Phi dy'\big)^2 dxdy\Big|\\
&+ C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y u^s\big(\int_{1-2\delta}^{y}\frac{\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi}{(\partial_y u^s)^2} dy'\big)^2 dxdy\Big|\\
&+ C\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)} \varphi^{\theta_1}\frac{1}{\partial_y u^s}(\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi)^2 dxdy\Big|\\
\triangleq& E_{11}+E_{12}+E_{13}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$E_{11} \le C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}},$$

and

$$E_{13} \le C\int_{1-2\delta}^{a}\frac{\varphi^{\theta_1}}{\partial_y u^s}dy\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac12}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{L^\infty_y L^2_x} \le C\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}.$$

Similar to E_{13}, we have

$$E_{12} \le C\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac38,0}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}.$$

This shows that for any $\delta_1>0$,

$$E_1 \le C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}\big) + \delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$E_2 \leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}\big) + \delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}.$$

Thus, we get

$$B_{33} \leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}\big) + 2\delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}.$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_3 \leq &-\big(\frac{c^2}{4} - C_1\delta\big)\|(\partial_y u_1)_\Phi \varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + C\big(\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} \\ &+ \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}}\big) + 2\delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up the estimates of B_1, B_2, B_3 and taking δ small enough, we conclude the lemma. □

Now we are in position to prove Proposition 5.3.

Proof. Recall that w_2 satisfies

$$\partial_t w_2 + u^s\partial_x w_2 - \partial_y^2 w_2 = F_2. \tag{5.3}$$

Applying $e^{\Phi(t,D_x)}$ to (5.3), we get

$$\partial_t(w_2)_\Phi + \lambda\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+2\theta}(w_2)_\Phi + u^s\partial_x(w_2)_\Phi - \partial_y^2(w_2)_\Phi = (F_2)_\Phi. \tag{5.4}$$

Taking $\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{7}{2}}$ on both sides of (5.4) and taking L^2 inner product with $\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}$, we obatin

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + \lambda\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{4}+\theta,0}} + \int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_x(w_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}dxdy \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y^2(w_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}dxdy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_t\varphi|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi|^2dxdy + \big((F_2)_\Phi, (w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}\big)_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}. \end{aligned}$$

We get by integration by parts that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+} u^s\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_x(w_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}dxdy = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &-\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y^2(w_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{1+\theta_1}dxdy \\ &= \|\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} + (1+\theta_1)\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_y\varphi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi dxdy \\ &\geq \|\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} - C\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}} \\ &\geq \|\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}} - C\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{5}{8},0}} - \delta_2\|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{8},0}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used $|\partial_y\varphi| \leq C$ and $\psi_2(y) = 1$ for $y \in \mathrm{supp}\partial_y\varphi$. Similarly, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\varphi^{\theta_1}\partial_t\varphi|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}(w_2)_\Phi|^2dxdy \leq C\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac{1}{2},0}}.$$

With the above estimates and using Lemma 5.4, we deduce our result. □

6. Gevrey regularity estimate of h

Proposition 6.1. *Let h be a solution of (3.5) in $[0,T]$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+\lambda\|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}^2+\|\partial_y h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\Big(\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}^2+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}^2+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac58,0}}^2+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}^2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The proposition follows from the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.2. *Let h be a smooth solution of (3.5) in $[0,T]$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+\lambda\|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}^2+\|\partial_y h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\big(\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}^2\big)+2\big(\phi_3'(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying $e^{\Phi(t,D_x)}$ on (3.5) and making $H^{3,0}$ energy estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2+\lambda\|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}^2-\big((\partial_y^2h)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\&\le-\big(u^s\partial_x h_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}+\big((\partial_t d-\partial_y^2 d)(\partial_y u)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}-2\big((\partial_y d\partial_y^2u)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\&\quad-\big(d(v\partial_y^2u^s)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $h_\Phi|_{y=0}=0$, we get by integration by parts that

$$\big(u^s\partial_x h_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}=0,\quad -\big((\partial_y^2h)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}=\|(\partial_y h)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}-2\big((\partial_y d\partial_y^2u)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}=&2\big((\partial_y^2 d\partial_y u)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}+2\big((\partial_y d\partial_y u)_\Phi,\partial_y h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\\le&C\big(\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}^2+\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2\big)+\frac{1}{16}\|(\partial_y h)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

After some calculations, we have

$$\partial_t d-\partial_y^2 d=\frac{\partial_y^3u^s\phi_3'}{(\partial_y^2u^s)^{\frac32}}-\frac{\phi_3''}{(\partial_y^2u^s)^{\frac12}}-\frac34\frac{(\partial_y^3u^s)^2\phi_3}{(\partial_y^2u^s)^{\frac52}},$$

which gives

$$\big((\partial_t d-\partial_y^2 d)(\partial_y u)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\le C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}\|h_\Phi\|_{L^2}.$$

Using $\partial_x u+\partial_y v=0$, we get by integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned}-\big(d(v\partial_y^2u^s)_\Phi,h_\Phi\big)_{L^2}=&-\big(\phi_3(y)(\partial_y^2u^s)^{-1/2}\partial_y^2u^sv_\Phi,\phi_3(y)(\partial_y^2u^s)^{-1/2}(\partial_y u)_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\=&-\big(\phi_3(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)(\partial_y u)_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\=&2\big(\phi_3'(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}+\big(\phi_3(y)(\partial_y v)_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\\=&2\big(\phi_3'(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

The following lemma is devoted to the most trouble term $\big(\phi_3'(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}$. The argument is motivated by [6].

Lemma 6.3. *It holds that*

$$\big(\phi_3'(y)v_\Phi,\phi_3(y)u_\Phi\big)_{L^2}\leq C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14+\theta,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\Big).$$

Proof. Let $\mathrm{supp}\phi_3'=E_1\cup E_2$, where $E_1=[\frac12,\frac34]$ and $E_2=[\frac74,2]$. Then we write

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}^2_+}\phi_3\phi_3'v_\Phi u_\Phi dxdy\Big|\leq&\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_1}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy' u_\Phi dxdy\Big|\\&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy' u_\Phi dxdy\Big|\\\triangleq&J_1+J_2.\end{aligned}$$

In E_1, u can be expressed as $u=\partial_y u^s\int_0^y\overline{w}_1dy'$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}J_1\leq&\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_1}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\ \partial_y u^s\int_0^y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi dy'dxdy\Big|\\\leq&C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,0}}\end{aligned}$$

In E_2, u can be expressed as $u=\partial_y u^s\int_2^y\overline{w}_1dy'+\partial_y u^s\frac{u(t,x,2)}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}J_2\leq&\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\big(\partial_y u^s\int_2^y\overline{w}_1dy'\big)_\Phi dxdy\Big|\\&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\\triangleq&J_{21}+J_{22}.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to J_1, we have

$$J_{21}\leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,0}}.$$

Recall that $a(t)$ is a critical point of u^s. We decompose $\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'$ into the following three parts

$$\int_0^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'=\int_0^{a(t)}\partial_x u_\Phi dy'+\int_{a(t)}^{\frac74}\partial_x u_\Phi dy'+\int_{\frac74}^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_{22}\leq&\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^{a(t)}\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\ \partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{a(t)}^{\frac74}\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{\frac74}^y\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\\triangleq&K_1+K_2+K_3.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2, we get

$$K_1\leq\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_0^{1-2\delta}\partial_x u_\Phi dy'\ \partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\partial_x\big(\partial_y u^s\int_0^{1-2\delta}\phi_1 w_1 dy''\big)_\Phi dy'\ \partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\partial_x(\partial_y u^s\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy'')_\Phi dy'\ \partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
\triangleq& K_{11}+K_{12}+K_{13}.
\end{aligned}
$$

As in J_1, we have

$$
K_{11}+K_{12}\le C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}.
$$

For K_{13}, let us first estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34-\theta}(\partial_y u^s\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy'')_\Phi dy'\Big\|_{L^2_x}\\
\le&\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\partial_y u^s\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34-\theta}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2_x}}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy''dy'\\
\le&\int_{1-2\delta}^{a(t)}\partial_y u^s\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac58}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2_x}^{1-\alpha}\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34}(w_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2_x}^{\alpha}\varphi^{\frac{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}{2}}}{(\partial_y u^s)^2\varphi^{\frac{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}{2}}}dy''dy'\\
\le&\int_{1-2\delta}^{a}\partial_y u^s\Big(\int_{1-2\delta}^{y'}\frac{1}{(\partial_y u^s)^4\varphi^{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}}dy''\Big)^{\frac12}dy'\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac58}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha}\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{\alpha}\\
\le&\int_{1-2\delta}^{a}|y'-a(t)|^{-\frac12-\frac{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}{2}}dy'\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac58}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha}\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{\alpha}\\
\le&C\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac58}(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha}\|\langle D_x\rangle^{\frac34}(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|_{L^2}^{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\alpha=1-8\theta$ and take $\frac{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}{2}<\frac12$ to ensure that $\int_{1-2\delta}^{a}|y'-a(t)|^{-\frac12-\frac{\alpha(1+\theta_1)}{2}}dy'\le C$. As a result, we obtain

$$
K_{13}\le C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\big).
$$

Then we have

$$
K_1\le C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\big).
$$

For K_2, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_2\le&\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{a(t)}^{1+2\delta}\partial_x\big(\partial_y u^s\int_{1+2\delta}^{y'}\frac{\overline{w}_2}{(\partial_y u^s)^2}dy''\big)_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{a(t)}^{1+2\delta}\partial_x\big(\partial_y u^s\int_2^{1+2\delta}\overline{w}_1 dy''\big)_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{a(t)}^{1+2\delta}\partial_y u^s\frac{(\partial_x u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{1+2\delta}^{\frac74}\partial_x\big(\partial_y u^s\int_2^{y'}\overline{w}_1 dy''\big)_\Phi dy'\partial_y u^s\frac{\big(u(t,x,2)\big)_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|\\
&+\Big|\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{E_2}\phi_3\phi_3'\int_{1+2\delta}^{\frac74}\partial_y u^s\frac{(\partial_x u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dy'\ \partial_y u^s\frac{(u(t,x,2))_\Phi}{\partial_y u^s(t,2)}dxdy\Big|
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\triangleq K_{21}+\cdots+K_{25}.$$

Similar to K_{13}, we have

$$K_{21}\leq C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\big).$$

Similar to K_{12}, we have

$$K_{22}+K_{24}\leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}.$$

Integration by parts, we have

$$K_{23}+K_{25}=0.$$

This shows that

$$K_2\leq C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\big).$$

Similar to K_{24} and K_{25}, we have

$$K_3\leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac34,0}}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14,1}}.$$

Summing up the estimates of K_1,K_2,K_3, we deduce that

$$J_{22}\leq C\big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}}+\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}+\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58,0}}+\|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\big).$$

Putting the above estimates together, we conclude the lemma. □

7. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us first recover the regularity of u from w_1 and h.

Lemma 7.1. *It holds that*

$$\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,1}_\mu}\leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}+\|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}\big).$$

Proof. The proof is split into two steps.

Step 1. Estimate of $\|\partial_y u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}$

First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_y u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}\leq&\|1_{[0,\frac34]}(y)\partial_y u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}+\|1_{[\frac34,\frac74]}(y)\partial_y u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}+\|1_{[\frac74,+\infty)}(y)\partial_y u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}\\ \triangleq&I_1+I_2+I_3.\end{aligned}$$

For $y\in[0,\frac34]\cup[\frac74,+\infty)$, we have

$$\partial_y u(y)=\partial_y u^s\big(w_1-\partial_y(\frac{1}{\partial_y u^s})u\big),$$

which gives

$$I_1+I_3\leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}+C\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}.$$

For $y\in[\frac34,\frac74]$, using $\partial_y u=h(\partial_y^2 u^s)^{-\frac12}$, we get

$$I_2\leq C\|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}.$$

Step 2. Estimate of $\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu} \leq& \|1_{[0,\frac34]}(y)u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu} + \|1_{[\frac34,\frac74]}(y)u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu} + \|1_{[\frac74,+\infty)}(y)u_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}_\mu}\\ \triangleq& I_4 + I_5 + I_6.\end{aligned}$$

For $y \in [0, \frac34]$, we have

$$u(y) = \partial_y u^s\Big(\int_0^y w_1 dy'\Big),$$

which gives

$$I_4 \leq C\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}}.$$

For $y \in [\frac34, \frac74]$, we have

$$\widetilde{u}(y) = \int_{\frac34}^y \frac{h}{(\partial_y^2 u^s)^{\frac12}} dy' + u(t, x, \frac34), \tag{7.1}$$

from which and the estimate of I_4, we deduce that

$$I_5 \leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}\big).$$

For $y \in [\frac74, +\infty)$, we have

$$\widetilde{u}(y) = \partial_y u^s\Big(\int_{\frac74}^y w_1 dy'\Big) + \partial_y u^s \frac{u(t, x, \frac74)}{\partial_y u^s(t, \frac74)}$$

from which and the estimate of I_5, we deduce that

$$I_6 \leq C\big(\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|h_\Phi\|_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}\big).$$

Now, the inequality follows by putting the estimates of $I_1 - I_6$ together. □

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. The approximate solution can be easily constructed by adding the viscous term $-\epsilon^2\partial_x^2 u$ to (1.4). So, we just present the uniform estimate. For this end, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(t) \triangleq& \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}} + \|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2},\\ \mathcal{D}(t) \triangleq& \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac38,0}} + \|\partial_y(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|\partial_y h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2},\\ \mathcal{G}(t) \triangleq& \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34+\theta,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac58+\theta,0}} + \|(w_2)_\Phi\varphi^{\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}}\|^2_{H^{\frac34+\theta,0}} + \|h_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14+\theta,0}}.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing λ large enough and δ_2 suitably small, we infer from Proposition 4.1, Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.3, Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 7.1 that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(t) + \lambda\mathcal{G}(t) + \mathcal{D}(t) \leq C\mathcal{E}(t).$$

Then Gronwall's inequality gives

$$\mathcal{E}(t) + \lambda\int_0^t \mathcal{G}(s)ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}(s)ds \leq \mathcal{E}(0)e^{Ct} \tag{7.2}$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. □

8. Note on well-posedness in Gevrey class 2

Let us explain how to use a new unknown $h_1 = \partial_y^2 u - \frac{\partial_y^3 u^s}{\partial_y^2 u^s}\partial_y u$ introduced in [10] to obtain the well-posedness of (1.4) in Gevrey class 2 in our framework. It is easy to verify that h_1 satisfies the following equation

$$\partial_t h_1 + u^s\partial_x h_1 + \partial_x w_2 - \partial_y^2 h_1 = \partial_t\Big(\frac{\partial_y^3 u^s}{\partial_y^2 u^s}\Big)\partial_y u + \Big[\frac{\partial_y^3 u^s}{\partial_y^2 u^s}, \partial_y^2\Big]\partial_y u.$$

The unknown h_1 is well-defined in non-monotonic domain. It is easy to show that

$$(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)\cap L^2(0,T;H^{\frac14,0}), \quad \overline{h}_1 = \phi_3(y)h_1,$$

if $(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac34,0})$. On the other hand, if we know that $(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac14,0})$ which will imply $\partial_y^2 u_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac14,0})$ because of $\partial_y u_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac14,0})$ by Lemma 7.1, we can show that $(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi \in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac34,0})$ by following the proof of Proposition 5.1. More precisely, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + (\lambda - C)\|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}} + \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\
&\quad\le C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}_\mu} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\Big),\\
&\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + (\lambda - C)\|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}} + \|\partial_y(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}}\\
&\quad\le C\Big(\|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac12,0}} + \|(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,0}}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\|h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2} + \lambda\|h_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,0}} + \|\partial_y h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2}\\
&\quad\le C\Big(\|h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2} + \|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\Big),\\
&\frac{d}{dt}\|(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{L^2} + (\lambda - C)\|(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,0}} + \|\partial_y(\overline{h}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{L^2}\\
&\quad\le C\Big(\|h_\Phi\|^2_{L^2} + \|u_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac14,1}} + \|(\overline{w}_1)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}} + \|(\overline{w}_2)_\Phi\|^2_{H^{\frac34,0}}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can close the energy estimates in Gevrey class 2.

Acknowledgments

Z. Zhang is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 11371039 and 11421101.

References

[1] R. Alexandre, Y. Wang, C.- J. Xu and T. Yang, Well-posedness of the Prandtl equation in Sobolev spaces, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **28**(2015), 745-784.

[2] H. Bahouri, J. Y. Chemin and R. Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 343, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

[3] D. Chen, Y. Wang and Z. Zhang, *Well-posedness of the Prandtl equation with monotonicity in Sobolev Spaces*, submitted.

[4] W. E, Boundary layer theory and the zero-viscosity limit of the Navier-Stokes equation, *Acta Math. Sin.*, **16** (2000), 207-218.

[5] D. Gérard-Varet and E. Dormy, On the ill-posedness of the Prandtl equation, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **23** (2010), 591-609.

[6] D. Gérard-Varet and N. Masmoudi, Well-posedness for the Prandtl system without analyticity or monotonicity, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, **48** (2015), 1273-1325. .
[7] D. Gérard-Varet and T. Nguyen, Remarks on the ill-posedness of the Prandtl equation, *Asymptot. Anal.*, **77** (2012), 71-88.
[8] Y. Guo and T. Nguyen, A note on Prandtl boundary layers, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **64** (2011), 1416-1438.
[9] I. Kukavica, N. Masmoudi, V. Vicol and T. K. Wong, On the local well-posedness of the Prandtl and the hydrostatic Euler equations with multiple monotonicity regions, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **46** (2014), 3865-3890.
[10] W. Li and T. Yang, Well-posedness in Gevrey space for the Prandtl equations with non-degenerate critical points, arXiv:1609.08430.
[11] M. C. Lombardo, M. Cannone and M. Sammartino, Well-posedness of the boundary layer equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **35** (2003), 987-1004.
[12] N. Masmoudi and T. K. Wong, Local-in-time existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Prandtl equations by energy methods, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **68** (2015), 1683-1741.
[13] G. Métivier, *Para-differential calculus and applications to the Cauchy problem for nonlinear systems*, Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio De Giorgi (CRM) Series, 5, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2008.
[14] O. A. Oleinik and V. N. Samokhin, *Mathematical models in boundary layer theory*, Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation 15 Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Fla., 1999.
[15] L. Prandtl, *Ü*ber Flüssigkeitsbewegung bei sehr kleiner Reibung, *Verhandlung des III Intern. Math.-Kongresses, Heidelberg,* 1904, 484-491.
[16] M. Sammartino and R. E. Caflisch, Zero viscosity limit for analytic solutions, of the Navier-Stokes equation on a half-space. I. Existence for Euler and Prandtl equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **192** (1998), 433-461.
[17] Z. Xin and L. Zhang, On the global existence of solutions to the Prandtl's system, *Adv. Math.*, **181** (2004), 88-133.
[18] P. Zhang and Z. Zhang, Long time well-posedness of Prandtl system with small and analytic initial data, *J. Functional Analysis*, 270(2016), 2591-2615.

College of Mathematics and Information Science, Jiangxi Normal University, 330022, Nanchang, P. R. China
E-mail address: chendx020@aliyun.com

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, 100871, Beijing, P. R. China
E-mail address: wangyuxi0422@pku.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, 100871, Beijing, P. R. China
E-mail address: zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn